

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 28 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 22 stand rejected as anticipated. Claims 23 to 28 stand withdrawn.

Claims 1 to 3 are cancelled.

The limitations of Claim 5 are included in Claim 4 and Claim 5 is canceled.

The limitations of Claim 8 are included in Claim 6, and Claims 7 to 10 are cancelled.

Claims 15 to 17 are canceled.

The limitations of Claim 20 are included in Claim 18 and Claim 20 is cancelled.

Applicant confirms the election of Group I claims, Claims 1 to 22.

Claims 1 to 10 and 12 to 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by "COM/COBRA Interworking" by Digital Equipment Corporation.

Claims 1 to 3, 7 to 10, and 15 to 17 are cancelled and so the anticipation rejection of each of these Claims is rendered moot.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claims 4 and 5, the Examiner stated:

As to claims 4 and 5, refer to Claims 1 to 3 for rejection.

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of Claim 4. Claim 4 recites in part:

using said bridge object to generate a proxy wrapping an interface in said second execution environment

The Examiner has cited no teaching of such use of the bridge object to generate a proxy. The Examiner cited the

Surrogate Server as the proxy, i.e., "a proxy (Surrogate Server)," but failed to cite any teaching that the Surrogate Server was generated by a bridge. Accordingly, the reference fails to show "The identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." MPEP §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 2, p. 2100-73, (May 2004). Thus, according to the MPEP, the reference fails to anticipate Claim 4. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 4.

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of Claim 6. The Examiner stated in part:

The implementation of a member function may need to perform any required transformation of arguments(e.g. convert strings between UNICODE and ANSI) . . .

Claim 6 does not recite transformation in general, but rather a specific way to convert parameters. The section relied upon by the Examiner fails to teach how the transformation is performed and so fails to meet the requirements of the MPEP as quoted above. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 6.

Claim 12 includes the same limitation as discussed above with respect to Claim 6. Therefore, the above remarks with respect to Claim 6 are incorporated herein by reference. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 12.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 12 and so distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as Claim 12. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 13 and 14.

Claim 18 includes the same limitation as discussed above with respect to Claim 6. Therefore, the above remarks with respect to Claim 6 are incorporated herein by reference.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 18.

Claims 19, 21, and 22 depend from Claim 18 and so distinguish over Claim 18 for at least the same reasons as Claim 18. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 19, 21, and 22.

Claim 11 stands rejected as obvious. However, assuming the combination of information is correct, the additional information does not overcome the deficiency of the primary reference. Moreover, the Official Notice is not well founded. The second execution environment for consistency with the primary rejection would be the CORBA system and not the COM system as stated in the rejection. (See the rejection of Claim 1.) Accordingly, the Official Notice is unrelated to the base rejection. Therefore, the rejection fails to establish a prima facie obviousness rejection. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 11.

Claims 4, 6, 11, 12 to 14, 18 to 19, 21 to 28 remain in the application. Claims 4, 6, and 18 have been amended. Claims 1 to 3, 5, 7 to 10, 15 to 17, and 20 were canceled. Claims 23 to 28 were withdrawn. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 10, 2004.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

November 10, 2004
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880